

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of claims**

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-2 and 4-14 will be pending. Claims 1 and 13 will have been amended. Claims 3 and 15-22 will be canceled. Reconsideration of the Office Action of December 16, 2009 is respectfully requested.

### **I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Oorshot et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,229,894. The Examiner asserted that Van Oorshot et al. teach the limitations of claims 1-14 and 17-22. With regard to claims 1 and 13, the Examiner asserted that Van Oorshot et al. teach "wherein encrypted search conditions are included within the decryption keys" in column 3, lines 1-15; and column 7, lines 31-61. Applicant respectfully traverses.

In particular, Applicant has amended claim 1 to substantially more clearly recite that the "decryption keys having embedded encrypted search conditions therein to only provide access to encrypted data meeting criteria specified by the encrypted search conditions, wherein the criteria specify an identification of the portions of the communications traffic within the encrypted data to be decrypted." Thus, the decryption keys are provided with encrypted search conditions that specify "the portions of the packet-data communications traffic within the encrypted data to be decrypted." The present invention enables the provisioning of decryption keys that can decrypt

only specified portions of the captured packet-data communications traffic (e.g., a particular call). Claim 13 has been amended to recite similar, but not identical features.

In contrast, Van Oorshot providing decryption keys based on "the identity of the requesting entity." See, col. 3, lines 3-8; See, also col. 7, lines 31-42. Thus, Van Oorshot provides "controlled access to user specific information" based on a requisite that the system has knowledge of the requesting party. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Van Oorshot that the decryption keys include any criteria that limits access to the encrypted data based on specified criteria about the encrypted data to be decrypted. The present invention need not know the identity of the requestor to provide the decryption keys. Rather, it only needs to know what encrypted data needs to be decrypted.

As such, Van Oorshot et al. do not teach explicitly recited elements of claims 1 and 13. Therefore, claims 1 and 13 patentably define over Van Oorshot. With regard to claims 2-12 and 14, Applicant notes that these claims depend from what is believed to be an allowable base claim (i.e., claims 1 and 13, respectively). As such, without addressing the propriety of the Examiner's rejection. Applicant submits that claims 2-12 and 14 are now allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Oorshot et al.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that all of the pending claims are allowable over the references of record, and requests entry of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 15, 2010

/Lawrence A. Aaronson/  
Lawrence A. Aaronson  
Reg. No. 38,369

Lawrence A. Aaronson, P.C.  
12850 Highway 9  
Suite 600 - PMB 338  
Alpharetta, GA 30004  
Telephone: (770) 475-9129  
Facsimile: (770) 809-5028